

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 05610 231450Z

43

ACTION SS-30

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00 /031 W

----- 054584

P R 231340Z OCT 73

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2148

INFO DOD WASHDC

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 5610

EXDIS/SALT

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDSI

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON OCTOBER 23 MEETING (SALT TWO - 319)

REF: STATE 208787

1. AT FORMAL MEETING TODAY SEMENOV MADE VERY BRIEF (15 MINUTES) PRO FORMA STATEMENT DEFENDING THEIR POSITION ON FBS, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO ARTICLE II OF THEIR DRAFT, AND I MADE NO STATEMENT.

2. IN SUBSEQUENT PRIVATE MEETING, IN INFORMED HIM IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARA 1 REFTEL AND THEN SAID THAT I HAD AT VARIOUS TIMES TRANSMITTED TO WASHINGTON MY UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR POSITIONS ON VARIOUS POINTS OF THEIR DRAFT -- IN PART BASED UPON INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF OUR DELEGATIONS AND IN PART MY INTERPRETATION OF THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR DRAFT. HOWEVER IN FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THEIR DRAFT I WANTED TO BE AS CERTAIN AS I COULD THAT MY INTERPRETATIONS WERE CORRECT. IN ASKING THESE QUESTIONS I WAS, OF COURSE, IN NO SENSE IMPLYING ANY AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVIETS' POSITIONS, BUT SIMPLY WAS ATTEMPTING TO UNDERSTAND THOSE POSITIONS AS ACCURATELY AS I COULD. I SAID THAT IF HE COULD ANSWER ANY OF MY QUESTIONS TODAY I WOULD OF COURSE BE PLEASED, BUT I WOULD SUSPECT THAT HE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 05610 231450Z

WOULD WANT TO CONSIDER THEM BEFORE GIVING ME ANSWERS;

HOWEVER THE SOONER HE COULD GIVE ME ANSWERS, THE MORE HELPFUL IT WOULD BE IN CONSIDERING THEIR POSITION. I SAID THAT I WAS ASKING THESE QUESTIONS AT OUR PRIVATE MEETING IN ORDER TO GIVE HIM MAXIMUM FLEXIBILITY IN WHAT WAY HE WISHED TO REPLY. I THEN READ AND LEFT WITH HIM THE ENGLISH TEXT OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

QUOTE

1. ARTICLE II - "STRATEGIC BOMBERS"

IT IS THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE US SIDE THAT THE SOVIET SIDE CONSIDERS THE TERM "STRATEGIC BOMBER" TO BE EQUIVALENT TO THE US TERM "HEAVY BOMBER," AND THAT THIS CATEGORY INCLUDES ONLY THOSE HEAVY BOMBERS ON WHICH THERE HAD BEEN TENTATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SIDES IN SALT ONE? IS THIS CORRECT?

2. ARTICLE II - "IN RESERVE"

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE TERM "IN RESERVE" AS, FOR EXAMPLE, WITH RESPECT TO HEAVY BOMBERS? HOW DOES IT DIFFER FROM THE TERM "MOTH BALL?"

3. ARTICLE III - "LIMIT FIXED LAND-BASED...ICBM LAUNCHERS TO THE NUMBERS WHICH THE PARTIES HAVE..."

IT IS THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE US SIDE THAT, ALTHOUGH THE FOREGOING LANGUAGE ONLY LIMITS THE NUMBER OF SILOS, THE SOVIET SIDE INTENDS THAT RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SILOS WOULD NOT BE PERMITTED. IS THIS CORRECT?

4. ARTICLE III - "LIGHT ICBMS...HEAVY ICBMS"

HOW DOES THE SOVIET SIDE PROPOSE TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN "LIGHT" AND "HEAVY" ICBMS?

5. ARTICLES III AND IV - ICBM AND SLBM LEVELS

WHAT IS THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SLBM LAUNCHERS TO BE PERMITTED EACH SIDE? IN ORDER TO REACH THESE MAXIMUM SLBM

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 05610 231450Z

LEVELS, WOULD OLDER ICBM LAUNCHERS NEED TO BE RETIRED AS PROVIDED IN THE INTERIM AGREEMENT AND THE ICBM CEILINGS ACCORDINGLY REDUCED? WOULD ARTICLE IV LIMIT ALL SLBM LAUNCHERS ON ALL TYPES OF SUBMARINES?

6. ARTICLE VIII - "AGREED PORTION OF THE TOTAL NUMBERS..."

IT IS THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE US SIDE THAT THE SOVIET

SIDE INTERPRETS "AGREED PORTION" AS EITHER A PERCENTAGE OR ANUMBER OF THE MISSILE LAUNCHERS PERMITTED UNDER ARTICLES III AND IV AND THAT THETHER THE PERCENTAGE OR NUMBER WAS EQUAL OR UNEQUAL FOR THE TWO SIDES WOULD BE SUBJECT TO NEGOTIATION. IS THIS CORRECT?

7. ARTICLE X - "SUBMARINES OF A NEW GENERATION"

IT IS THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE US SIDE THAT THE SOVIET SIDE INTERPRETS THE TERM "SUBMARINES OF A NEW GENERATION, ARMED WITH BALLISTIC MISSILES" TO INCLUDE US TRIDENT-CLASS SUBMARINES. IS THIS CORRECT? WHAT SOVIET SUBMARIENS WOULD BE INCLUDED? IS IT THE INTENT OF THE SOVIET SIDE THAT THE PHRASE WOULD INCLUDE, OR NOT INCLUDE, SUCH MAJOR CHANGES IN EXISTING AND REPLACEMENT AND MODERNIZATION SUBMARINES AS CHANGES IN THE NUMBERS AND SIZES OF LAUNCH TUBES, IMPROVEMENTS IN PROPULSION SYSTEMS OR REDUCTION IN NOISE LEVELS?

8. ARTICLE X - "SEA-BASED STRATEGIC CRUISE MISSILES"

WITH RESPECT TO SEA-BASED CRUISE MISSILES, THE SOVIET SIDE IS NOW USING THE WORD "STRATEGIC" TO REPLACE THE PHRASE "SPECIALLY DESIGNED TO STRIKE LAND TARGETS." HOWEVER THE US DIDE IS NOT CLEAR ON HOW THE SOVIET SIDE DEFINESE "STRATEGIC" IN THIS CONTEXT.

9. ARTICLE X - "NEW TYPES OF STRATEGIC BOMBERS"

HOW WOULD THE SOVIET SIDE DEFINE "NEW TYPES OF STRATEGIC BOMBERS?"

10. ARTICLE X - "LONG-RANGE AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILES"

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 05610 231450Z

HOW DOES THE SOVIET SIDE DEFINE "LONG RANGE" IN THE TERM "LONG-RANGE AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILES?"

11. ARTICLE XI - FUTURE STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS"

IT IS THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE US SIDE THAT THE LANGUAGE IN THE SOVIET DRAFT WOULD PERMIT THE DEPLOYMENT OF ANY "FUTURE STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS" UNLESS BOTH SIDES IN EACH CASE AGREED TO THE CONTRARY. IS THIS CORRECT?

UNQUOTE

3. IN REPLYING TO FIRST PART OF MY STATEMENT ABOUT NEGATIVE WASHINGTON REACTION AND DISAPPOINTMENT AT

ONE-SIDEDNESS OF SOVIET DRAFT, SEMENOV SAID THAT THE SOVIETS HAD TABLED THEIR DRAFT IN ACCORDANCE "WITH UNDERSTANDING REACHED AT THE JUNE 1973 SUMMIT MEETING AND AS EXPRESSED IN THE UNE 21 STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES," AND THAT THE PROBLEM NOW WAS TO FIND WHAT AREA OF COMMON GROUND EXISTED BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES, TO DEFINE THE DIFFERENCES AND TO DISCUSS THEM.

4. WITH RESPECT TO THE LIST OF QUESTIONS, HE SAID THEY FELL INTO THREE CATEGORIES: (1) THOSE WHICH REQUIRE FURTHER CLARIFICATION, (2) THOSE WHICH REQUIRE "ADDITIONAL SUBSTANTIATION" BY THE SOVIET SIDE, AND (3) THOSE THAT REQUIRE NEGOTIATION. HOWEVER HE ACCEPTED THE QUESTIONS, BUT MADE NO COMMITMENT AS TO WHEN OR HOW HE WOULD REPLY. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 23 OCT 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973SALTT05610
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: RR
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731016/aaaaaInd.tel
Line Count: 184
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 73 STATE 208787
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 28 DEC 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <28-Dec-2001 by elbezefj>; APPROVED <20 FEB 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: COMMENTS ON OCTOBER 23 MEETING (SALT TWO - 319)
TAGS: PARM
To: SECSTATE WASHDC DOD WASHDC
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005